UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,985	07/13/2006	Naoyuki Kohno	80441(302767)	1712
	7590	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 5587	74	YAKOVLEVA, GALINA M		
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/08/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/585,985	KOHNO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
GALINA YAKOVLEVA	1641

GAI	LINA YAKOVLEVA	1641				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 July 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (was for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1 periods:	es: (1) an amendment, affidavi vith appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviso no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). Ol	ry Action, or (2) the date set forth nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any expended patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complianc filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS	ir the time period set forth in s	7 OFN 41.37(a).				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better fo appeal; and/or 	rm for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corre	sponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 ar						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. S	ee attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ⋈ will not be entered, or b) ⋈ will be entered and an explanation of 						
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.		ii be entered and an explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>12-34</u> .						
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
	/SHAFIQUL HAQ/					
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1641				

The applicant's amendment to the specification is not entered because the Renewed Petition for Acceptance of an Unintentionally Delayed Priority Claim filed 28 March 2010 is dismissed.

Continuation of 13. Other: The rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishibu et al. is maintained. The instant application, filed July 13, 2006, is a national stage application of PCT/JP05/00737, filed January 21, 2005, which claims foreign priority to PCT/JP2004/000504, filed January 21, 2004. For purposes of section 102(b), the U.S. filing date is January 21, 2005. Since the Nishibu et al. reference was published in 2003, it qualifies as a 102(b) reference against the instant claims. Applicant traverses the 103 (a) rejection on the grounds that "the skilled artisan would perform binding of protein in the presence of methanol only, but would not think to add SDS, because of the disclosures in the cited art." This argument is not persuasive for the reasons set forth in the Final Office Action. In addition, it is noted that, in Abstract, Jacobson indicates that both methanol and SDS are commonly used additives for immobilizing proteins. This common knowledge would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the teachings of Cheley to arrive at the claimed method. The rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is therefore maintained.